

Learning from the Success of MPI

William D. Gropp

Mathematics and Computer Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory,
Argonne, Illinois 60439, gropp@mcs.anl.gov,
WWW home page: www.mcs.anl.gov/~gropp

Abstract. The Message Passing Interface (MPI) has been extremely successful as a portable way to program high-performance parallel computers. This success has occurred in spite of the view of many that message passing is difficult and that other approaches, including automatic parallelization and directive-based parallelism, are easier to use. This paper argues that MPI has succeeded because it addresses *all* of the important issues in providing a parallel programming model.

1 Introduction

The Message Passing Interface (MPI) is a very successful approach for writing parallel programs. Implementations of MPI exist for most parallel computers, and many applications are now using MPI as the way to express parallelism (see [1] for a list of papers describing applications that use MPI). The reasons for the success of MPI are not obvious. In fact, many users and researchers complain about the difficulty of using MPI. Commonly raised issues include the complexity of MPI (often as measured by the number of functions), performance issues (particularly the latency or cost of communicating short messages), and the lack of compile or runtime help (e.g., compiler transformations for performance; integration with the underlying language to simplify the handling of arrays, structures, and native datatypes; and debugging). More subtle issues, such as the complexity of nonblocking communication and the lack of elegance relative to a parallel programming language, are also raised [2]. With all of these criticisms, why has MPI enjoyed such success?

One might claim that MPI has succeeded simply because of its *portability*, that is, the ability to run an MPI program on most parallel platforms. But while portability was certainly a necessary condition, it was not sufficient. After all, there were other, equally portable programming models, including many message-passing and communication-based models. For example, the **socket** interface was (and remains) widely available and was used as an underlying communication layer by other parallel programming packages, such as PVM [3] and p4 [4]. An obvious second requirement is that of *performance*: the ability of the programming model to deliver the available performance of the underlying hardware. This clearly distinguishes MPI from interfaces such as sockets. However, even this is not enough. This paper argues that six requirements must *all* be satisfied for a parallel programming model to succeed, that is, to be widely

adopted. Programming models that address a subset of these issues can be successfully applied to a subset of applications, but such models will not reach a wide audience in high-performance computing.

2 Necessary Properties

The MPI programming model describes how separate *processes* communicate. In MPI-1 [5], communication occurs either through point-to-point (two-party) message passing or through collective (multiparty) communication. Each MPI process executes a program in an address space that is private to that process.

2.1 Portability

Portability is the most important property of a programming model for high-performance parallel computing. The high-performance computing community is too small to dictate solutions and, in particular, to significantly influence the direction of commodity computing. Further, the lifetime of an application (often ten to twenty years, rarely less than five years) greatly exceeds the lifetime of any particularly parallel hardware. Hence, any application must be prepared to run effectively on many generations of parallel computer, and that goal is most easily achieved by using a portable programming model.

Portability, however, does not require taking a “lowest common denominator” approach. A good design allows the use of performance-enhancing features without mandating them. For example, the message-passing semantics of MPI allows for the direct copy of data from the user’s send buffer to the receive buffer without any other copies.¹ However, systems that can’t provide this direct copy (because of hardware limitations or operating system restrictions) are permitted, under the MPI model, to make one or more copies. Thus MPI programs remain portable while exploiting hardware capabilities.

Unfortunately, portability does not imply portability with performance, often called *performance portability*. Providing a way to achieve performance while maintaining portability is the second requirement.

2.2 Performance

MPI enables performance of applications in two ways. For small numbers of processors, MPI provides an effective way to manage the use of memory. To understand this, consider a typical parallel computer as shown in Figure 1.

The memory near the CPU, whether it is a large cache (symmetric multiprocessor) or cache and memory (cluster or NUMA), may be accessed more rapidly than far-away memory. Even for shared-memory computers, the ratio of the number of cycles needed to access memory in L1 cache and main memory is roughly a hundred; for large, more loosely connected systems the ratio can exceed ten to one hundred thousand. This large ratio, even between the cache and

¹ This is sometimes called a zero-copy transfer.




Fig. 1. A typical parallel computer

local memory, means that applications must carefully manage memory locality if they are to achieve high performance.

The separate processes of the MPI programming model provide a natural and effective match to this property of the hardware.

This is not a new approach. The C language provides **register**, originally intended to aid compilers in coping with a two-level memory hierarchy (registers and main memory). Some parallel languages, such as HPF [6], UPC [7], or CoArray Fortran [8], distinguish between local and shared data. Even programming models that do not recognize a distinction between local and remote memory, such as OpenMP, have implementations that often require techniques such as “first touch” to ensure that operations make effective use of cache. The MPI model, based on communicating processes, each with its own memory, is a good match to current hardware.

For large numbers of processors, MPI also provides effective means to develop scalable algorithms and programs. In particular, the collective communication and computing routines such as **MPI_Allreduce** provide a way to express scalable operations without exposing system-specific features to the programmer. Also important for supporting scalability is the ability to express the most powerful scalable algorithms; this is discussed in Section 2.4.

Another contribution to MPI’s performance comes from its ability to work with the best compilers; this is discussed in Section 2.5. Also discussed there is how MPI addresses the performance-tradeoffs in using threads with MPI programs.

Unfortunately, while MPI achieves both portability and performance, it does not achieve perfect performance portability, defined as providing a single source that runs at (near) achievable peak performance on all platforms. This lack is sometimes given as a criticism of MPI, but it is a criticism that most other programming models also share. For example, Dongarra et al [9] describe six different ways to implement matrix-matrix multiply in Fortran for a single processor; not only is no one of the six optimal for all platforms but *none* of the six are optimal on modern cache-based systems. Another example is the very existence of vendor-optimized implementations of the Basic Linear Algebra Subroutines (BLAS). These are functionally simple and have implementations in Fortran and C; if compilers (good as they are) were capable of producing optimal code for these relatively simple routines, the hand-tuned (or machined-tuned [10]) versions would not be necessary. Thus, while performance portability is a desir-

able goal, it is unreasonable to expect parallel programming models to provide it when uniprocessor models cannot. This difficulty also explains why relying on compiler-discovered parallelism has usually failed: the problem remains too difficult. Thus a successful programming model must allow the programmer to help.

2.3 Simplicity and Symmetry

The MPI model is often criticized as being large and complex, based on the number of routines (128 in MPI-1 with another 194 in MPI-2). The number of routines is not a relevant measure, however. Fortran, for example, has a large number of intrinsic functions; C and Java rely on a large suite of library routines to achieve external effects such as I/O and graphics; and common development frameworks have hundreds to thousands of methods.

A better measure of complexity is the number of concepts that the user must learn, along with the number of exceptions and special cases. Measured in these terms, MPI is actually very simple.

Using MPI requires learning only a few concepts. Many MPI programs can be written with only a few routines; several subsets of routines are commonly recommended, including ones with as few as six functions. Note the plural: for different purposes, different subsets of MPI are used. For example, some recommend using only collective communication routines; others recommend only a few of the point-to-point routines. One key to the success of MPI is that these subsets can be used without learning the rest of MPI; in this sense, MPI is simple. Note that a smaller set of routines would *not* have provided this simplicity because, while some applications would find the routines that they needed, others would not.

Another sign of the effective design in MPI is the use of a single concept to solve multiple problems. This reduces both the number of items that a user must learn and the complexity of the implementation. For example, the MPI communicator both describes the group of communicating processes and provides a separate communication context that supports component-oriented software, described in more detail in Section 2.4. Another example is the MPI datatype; datatypes describe both the type (e.g., integer, real, or character) and layout (e.g., contiguous, strided, or indexed) of data. The MPI datatype solves the two problems of describing the types of data to allow for communication between systems with different data representations and of describing noncontiguous data layouts to allow an MPI implementation to implement zero-copy data transfers of noncontiguous data.

MPI also followed the principle of *symmetry*: wherever possible, routines were added to eliminate any exceptions. An example is the routine `MPI_Issend`. MPI provides a number of different send modes that correspond to different, well-established communication approaches. Three of these modes are the regular send (`MPI_Send`) and its nonblocking versions (`MPI_Isend`), and the synchronous send (`MPI_Ssend`). To maintain symmetry, MPI also provides the nonblocking synchronous send `MPI_Issend`. This send mode is meaningful (see [11, Section

7.6.1]) but is rarely used. Eliminating it would have removed a routine, slightly simplifying the MPI documentation and implementation. It would have created an exception, however. Instead of each MPI send mode having a nonblocking version, only some send modes would have nonblocking versions. Each such exception adds to the burden on the user and adds complexity: it is easy to forget about a routine that you never use; it is harder to remember arbitrary decisions on what is and is not available.

A place where MPI may have followed the principle of symmetry too far is in the large collection of routines for manipulating groups of processes. Particularly in MPI-1, the single routine `MPI_Comm_split` is all that is needed; few users need to manipulate groups at all. Once a routine working with MPI groups was introduced, however, symmetry required completing the set. Another place is in canceling of sends, where significant implementation complexity is required for an operation of dubious use.

Of course, more can be done to simplify the use of MPI. Some possible approaches are discussed in Section 3.1.

2.4 Modularity

Component-oriented software is becoming increasingly important. In commercial software, software components implementing a particular function are used to implement a clean, maintainable service. In high-performance computing, components are less common, with many applications being built as a monolithic code. However, as computational algorithms become more complex, the need to exploit software components embodying these algorithms increases.

For example, many modern numerical algorithms for the solution of partial differential equations are hierarchical, exploiting the structure of the underlying solution to provide a superior and scalable solution algorithm. Each level in that hierarchy may require a different solution algorithm; it is not unusual to have each level require a different decomposition of processes. Other examples are intelligent design automation programs that run application components such as fluid solvers and structural analysis codes under the control of a optimization algorithm.

MPI supports component-oriented software. Both describe the subset of processes participating in a component and to ensure that all MPI communication is kept within the component, MPI introduced the *communicator*.² Without something like a communicator, it is possible for a message sent by one component and intended for that component to be received by another component or by user code. MPI made reliable libraries possible.

Supporting modularity also means that certain powerful variable layout tricks (such as assuming that the variable `a` in an SPMD program is at the same address on all processors) must be modified to handle the case where each process may have a different stack-use history and variables may be dynamically allocated with different base addresses. Some programming models have assumed that all

² The context part of the communicator was inspired by Zipcode [12].

processes have the same layout of local variables, making it difficult or impossible to use those programming models with modern adaptive algorithms.

Modularity also deals with the complexity of MPI. Many tools have been built using MPI to provide the communication substrate; these tools and libraries provide the kind of easy-to-use interface for domain-specific applications that some developers feel are important; for example, some of these tools eliminate all evidence of MPI from the user program. MPI makes those tools possible. Note that the user base of these domain-specific codes may be too small to justify vendor-support of a parallel programming model.

2.5 Composability

One of the reasons for the continued success of Unix is the ease with which new solutions can be built by composing existing applications.

MPI was designed to work with other tools. This capability is vital, because the complexity of programs and hardware continues to increase. For example, the MPI specification was designed from the beginning to be thread-safe, since threaded parallelism was seen by the MPI Forum as a likely approach to systems built from a collection of SMP nodes. MPI-2 took this feature even further, acknowledging that there are performance tradeoffs in different degrees of thread-ness and providing a mechanism for the user to request a particular level of thread support from the MPI library. Specifically, MPI defines several degrees of thread support. The first, called `MPI_THREAD_SINGLE`, specifies that there is a single thread of execution. This allows an MPI implementation to avoid the use of thread-locks or other techniques necessary to ensure correct behavior with multithreaded codes. Another level of thread support, `MPI_THREAD_FUNNELLED`, specifies that the process may have multiple threads but all MPI calls are made by one thread. This matches the common use of threads for loop parallelism, such as the most common uses of OpenMP. A third level, `MPI_THREAD_MULTIPLE`, allows multiple threads to make MPI calls. While these levels of thread support do introduce a small degree of complexity, they reflect MPI's pragmatic approach to providing a workable tool for high-performance computing.

The design of MPI as a library means that MPI operations cannot be optimized by a compiler. However, it also means that any MPI library can exploit the newest and best compilers and that the compiler can be developed without worrying about the impact of MPI on the generated code—from the compiler's point of view, MPI calls are simply generic function calls.³ The ability of MPI to exploit improvements in other tools is called *composability*. Another example is in debuggers; because MPI is simply a library, any debugger can be used with MPI programs. Debuggers that are capable of handling multiple processes, such as TotalView [14], can immediately be used to debug MPI programs. Additional refinements, such as an interface to an abstraction of message passing that is

³ There are some conflicts between the MPI model and the Fortran language; these are discussed in [13, Section 10.2.2]. The issues are also not unique to MPI; for example, any asynchronous I/O library faces the same issues with Fortran.

described in [15], allows users to use the debugger to discover information about pending communication and unreceived messages.

More integrated approaches, such as language extensions, have the obvious benefits, but they also have significant costs. A major cost is the difficulty of exploiting advances in other tools and of developing and maintaining a large, integrated system.

OpenMP is an example of a programming model that achieves the effect of composability with the compilers because OpenMP requires essentially orthogonal changes to the compiler; that is, most of the compiler development can ignore the addition of OpenMP in a way that more integrated languages cannot.

2.6 Completeness

MPI provides a complete programming model. Any parallel algorithm can be implemented with MPI. Some parallel programming models have sacrificed completeness for simplicity. For example, a number of programming models have required that synchronization happens only collectively for all processes or tasks. This requirement significantly simplifies the programming model and allows the use of special hardware affecting all processes. Many existing programs also fit into this model; data-parallel programs are natural candidates for this model. But as discussed in Section 2.4, many programs are becoming more complex and are exploiting software components. Such applications are difficult, if not impossible, to build using restrictive programming models.

Another way to look at this is that while many programs may not be easy under MPI, no program is impossible. MPI is sometimes called the “assembly language” of parallel programming. Those making this statement forget that C and Fortran have also been described as portable assembly languages. The generality of the approach should not be mistaken for an unnecessary complexity.

2.7 Summary

Six different requirements have been discussed, along with how MPI addresses each. Each of these is *necessary* in a general-purpose parallel programming system.

Portability and performance are clearly required. Simplicity and symmetry cater to the *user* and make it easy to learn and use safely. Composability is required to prevent the approach from being left behind by the advance of other tools such as compilers and debuggers.

Modularity, like completeness, is required to ensure that tools can be built on top of the programming model. Without modularity, a programming model is suitable only for turnkey applications. While those may be important and easy to identify as customers, they represent the past rather than the future.

Completeness, like modularity, is required to ensure that the model supports a large enough community. While this does not mean that everyone uses every function, it means that the functionality that a user may need is likely to be

present. An early poll of MPI users [16] in fact found that while no one was using all of the MPI-1 routines, essentially all MPI-1 routines were in use by someone.

The open standards process (see [17] for a description of the process used to develop MPI) was an important component in its success. Similar processes are being adopted by others; see [18] for a description of the principles and advantages of an open standards process.

3 Where Next?

MPI is not perfect. But any replacement will need to improve on all that MPI offers, particularly with respect to performance and modularity, without sacrificing the ability to express any parallel program. Three directions are open to investigation: improvements in the MPI programming model, better MPI implementations, and fundamentally new approaches to parallel computing.

3.1 Improving MPI

Where can MPI be improved? A number of evolutionary enhancements are possible, many of which can be made by creating tools that make it easier to build and maintain MPI programs.

1. Simpler interfaces. A compiler (or a preprocessor) could provide a simpler, integrated syntax. For example, Fortran 90 array syntax could be supported without requiring the user to create special MPI datatypes. Similarly, the MPI datatype for a C structure could be created automatically. Some tools for the latter already exist. Note that support for array syntax is an example of support for a subset of the MPI community, many of whom use data structures that do not map easily onto Fortran 90 arrays. A precompiler approach would maintain the composability of the tools, particularly if debuggers understood preprocessed code.
2. Elimination of function calls. There is no reason why a sophisticated system cannot remove the MPI routine calls and replace them with inline operations, including handling message matching. Such optimizations have been performed for Linda programs [19] and for MPI subsets [20]. Many compilers already perform similar operations for simple numerical functions like **abs** and **sin**. This enhancement can be achieved by using preprocessors or precompilers and thus can maintain the composability of MPI with the best compilers.
3. Additional tools and support for correctness and performance debugging. Such tools include editors that can connect send and receive operations so that both ends of the operation are presented to the programmer, or performance tools for massively parallel programs. (Tools such as Vampir and Jumpshot [21] are a good start, but much more can be done to integrate the performance tool with source-code editors and performance predictors.)

4. Changes to MPI itself, such as read-modify-write additions to the remote memory access operations in MPI-2. It turns out to be surprisingly difficult to implement an atomic fetch-and-increment operation [22, Section 6.5.4] in MPI-2 using remote memory operations (it is quite easy using threads, but that usually entails a performance penalty).

3.2 Improving MPI Implementations

Having an implementation of MPI is just the beginning. Just as the first compilers stimulated work in creating better compilers by finding better ways to produce quality code, MPI implementations are stimulating work on better approaches for implementing the features of MPI. Early work along this line looked at better ways to implement the MPI datatypes [23, 24]. Other interesting work includes the use of threads to provide a lightweight MPI implementation [25, 26]. This work is particularly interesting because it involves code transformations to ensure that the MPI process model is preserved within a single, multithreaded Unix process.

In fact, several implementations of MPI fail to achieve the available asymptotic bandwidth or latency. For example, at least two implementations from different vendors perform unnecessary copies (in one case because of layering MPI over a lower-level software that does not match MPI's message-passing semantics). These implementations can be significantly improved. They also underscore the risk in evaluating the design of a programming model based on a particular implementation.

1. Improvement of the implementation of collective routines for most platforms. One reason, ironically, is that the MPI point-to-point communication routines on which most MPI implementations build their collective routines are too *high* level. An alternative approach is to build the collective routines on top of stream-oriented methods that understand MPI datatypes.
2. Optimization for new hardware, such as implementations of VIA or Infini-band. Work in this direction is already taking place, but more can be done, particularly for collective (as opposed to point-to-point) communication.
3. Wide area networks (1000 km and more). In this situation, the steps used to send a message can be tuned to this high-latency situation. In particular, approaches that implement speculative receives [27], strategies that make use of quality of service [28], or alternatives to IP/TCP may be able to achieve better performance.
4. Scaling to more than 10,000 processes. Among other things, this requires better handling of internal buffers; also, some of the routines for managing process mappings (e.g., `MPI_Graph_create`) do not have scalable definitions.
5. Parallel I/O, particularly for clusters. While parallel file systems such as PVFS [29] provide support for I/O on clusters, much more needs to be done, particularly in the areas of communication aggregation and in reliability in the presence of faults.

6. Fault tolerance. The MPI intercommunicator (providing for communication between two groups of processes) provides an elegant mechanism for generalizing the usual “two party” approach to fault tolerance. Few MPI implementations support fault tolerance in this situation, and little has been done to develop intercommunicator collective routines that provide a well-specified behavior in the presence of faults.
7. Thread-safe and efficient implementations for the support of “mixed model” (message-passing plus threads) programming. The need to ensure thread-safety of an MPI implementation used with threads can significantly increase latency. Architecting an MPI implementation to avoid or reduce these penalties remains a challenge.

3.3 New Directions

In addition to improving MPI and enhancing MPI implementations, more revolutionary efforts should be explored.

One major need is for a better match of programming models to the multilevel memory hierarchies that the speed of light imposes, without adding unmanageable complexity. Instead of denying the importance of hierarchical memory, we need a memory centric view of computing.

MPI’s performance comes partly by accident; the two-level memory model is better than a one-level memory model at allowing the programmer to work with the system to achieve performance. But a better approach needs to be found.

Two branches seem promising. One is to develop programming models targeted at hardware similar in organization to what we have today (see Figure 1). The other is to codevelop both new hardware and new programming models. For example, hardware built from processor-in-memory, together with hardware support for rapid communication of functions might be combined with a programming model that assumed distributed control. The Tera MTA architecture may be a step in such a direction, by providing extensive hardware support for latency hiding by extensive use of hardware threads. In either case, better techniques must be provided for both data transfer and data synchronization.

Another major need is to make it harder to write incorrect programs. A strength of MPI is that incorrect programs are usually deterministic, simplifying the debugging process compared to the race conditions that plague shared-memory programming. The synchronous send modes (e.g., `MPI_Ssend`) may also be used to ensure that a program has no dependence on message buffering.

4 Conclusion

The lessons from MPI can be summed up as follows: It is more important to make the hard things possible than it is to make the easy things easy. Future programming models must concentrate on helping programmers with what is hard, including the realities of memory hierarchies and the difficulties in reasoning about concurrent threads of control.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the Mathematical, Information, and Computational Sciences Division subprogram of the Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research, U.S. Department of Energy, under Contract W-31-109-Eng-38.

References

1. Papers about MPI (2001) www.mcs.anl.gov/mpi/papers.
2. Hansen, P.B.: An evaluation of the Message-Passing Interface. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices* **33** (1998) 65–72
3. Geist, A., Beguelin, A., Dongarra, J., Jiang, W., Manchek, B., Sunderam, V.: *PVM: Parallel Virtual Machine—A User's Guide and Tutorial for Network Parallel Computing*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA. (1994)
4. Boyle, J., Butler, R., Disz, T., Glickfeld, B., Lusk, E., Overbeek, R., Patterson, J., Stevens, R.: *Portable Programs for Parallel Processors*. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York (1987)
5. Message Passing Interface Forum: MPI: A Message-Passing Interface standard. *International Journal of Supercomputer Applications* **8** (1994) 165–414
6. Koelbel, C.H., Loveman, D.B., Schreiber, R.S., Jr., G.L.S., Zosel, M.E.: *The High Performance Fortran Handbook*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA (1993)
7. Carlson, W.W., Draper, J.M., Culler, D., Yelick, K., Brooks, E., Warren, K.: *Introduction to UPC and language specification*. Technical Report CCS-TR-99-157, Center for Computing Sciences, IDA, Bowie, MD (1999)
8. Numrich, R.W., Reid, J.: Co-Array Fortran for parallel programming. *ACM SIGPLAN FORTRAN Forum* **17** (1998) 1–31
9. Dongarra, J., Gustavson, F., Karp, A.: Implementing linear algebra algorithms for dense matrices on a vector pipeline machine. *SIAM Review* **26** (1984) 91–112
10. Whaley, R.C., Petitet, A., Dongarra, J.J.: Automated empirical optimizations of software and the ATLAS project. *Parallel Computing* **27** (2001) 3–35
11. Gropp, W., Lusk, E., Skjellum, A.: *Using MPI: Portable Parallel Programming with the Message Passing Interface*, 2nd edition. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA (1999)
12. Skjellum, A., Smith, S.G., Doss, N.E., Leung, A.P., Morari, M.: The design and evolution of Zipcode. *Parallel Computing* **20** (1994) 565–596
13. Message Passing Interface Forum: MPI2: A message passing interface standard. *International Journal of High Performance Computing Applications* **12** (1998) 1–299
14. TotalView Multiprocess Debugger/Analyzer (2000) <http://www.etnuc.com/Products/TotalView>.
15. Cownie, J., Gropp, W.: A standard interface for debugger access to message queue information in MPI. In Dongarra, J., Luque, E., Margalef, T., eds.: *Recent Advances in Parallel Virtual Machine and Message Passing Interface*. Volume 1697 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Berlin, Springer (1999) 51–58
16. MPI poll '95 (1995) http://www.dcs.ed.ac.uk/home/trollius/www.osc.edu/Lam/mpi/mpi_poll.html.
17. Hempel, R., Walker, D.W.: The emergence of the MPI message passing standard for parallel computing. *Computer Standards and Interfaces* **21** (1999) 51–62

18. Krechmer, K.: The need for openness in standards. *IEEE Computer* **34** (2001) 100–101
19. Carriero, N., Gelernter, D.: A foundation for advanced compile-time analysis of linda programs. In Banerjee, U., Gelernter, D., Nicolau, A., Padua, D., eds.: *Proceedings of Languages and Compilers for Parallel Computing*. Volume 589 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Berlin, Springer (1992) 389–404
20. Ogawa, H., Matsuoka, S.: OMPI: Optimizing MPI programs using partial evaluation. In: *Supercomputing'96*. (1996) <http://www.bib.informatik.th-darmstadt.de/sc96/OGAWA>.
21. Zaki, O., Lusk, E., Gropp, W., Swider, D.: Toward scalable performance visualization with Jumpshot. *High Performance Computing Applications* **13** (1999) 277–288
22. Gropp, W., Lusk, E., Thakur, R.: *Using MPI-2: Advanced Features of the Message-Passing Interface*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA (1999)
23. Gropp, W., Lusk, E., Swider, D.: Improving the performance of MPI derived datatypes. In Skjellum, A., Bangalore, P.V., Dandass, Y.S., eds.: *Proceedings of the Third MPI Developer's and User's Conference*, MPI Software Technology Press (1999) 25–30
24. Traeff, J.L., Hempel, R., Ritzdoff, H., Zimmermann, F.: Flattening on the fly: Efficient handling of MPI derived datatypes. Volume 1697 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Berlin, Springer (1999) 109–116
25. Demaine, E.D.: A threads-only MPI implementation for the development of parallel programs. In: *Proceedings of the 11th International Symposium on High Performance Computing Systems*. (1997) 153–163
26. Tang, H., Shen, K., Yang, T.: Compile/run-time support for threaded MPI execution on multiprogrammed shared memory machines. In Chien, A.A., Snir, M., eds.: *Proceedings of the 1999 ACM Sigplan Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming (PPoPP'99)*. Volume 34.8 of *ACM Sigplan Notices*, New York, ACM Press (1999) 107–118
27. Tatebe, O., Kodama, Y., Sekiguchi, S., Yamaguchi, Y.: Highly efficient implementation of MPI point-to-point communication using remote memory operations. In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Supercomputing (ICS-98)*, New York, ACM press (1998) 267–273
28. Roy, A., Foster, I., Gropp, W., Karonis, N., Sander, V., Toonen, B.: MPICH-GQ: Quality of service for message passing programs. Technical Report ANL/MCS-P838-0700, Mathematics and Computer Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory (2000)
29. Carns, P.H., Ligon III, W.B., Ross, R.B., Thakur, R.: PVFS: A parallel file system for Linux clusters. In: *Proceedings of the 4th Annual Linux Showcase and Conference*, Atlanta, GA, USENIX Association (2000) 317–327